

## **REMARKS**

### **I. INTRODUCTION**

Claims 1-4 and 8-18 are pending. Claims 1, 8, 12, and 16 are independent claims. Claims 5-7 are canceled herein without prejudice. Claim 1 is amended herein to address in informality alleged by the Examiner in the Office Action. Further, claims 1 and 16 are amended to address the Section 101 rejections of those claims. Claims 1, 2, 4, 7-9, 12-13, and 16 are also amended to address the Section 112 rejections of the claims. Moreover, additional amendments have been made to the independent claims for the purpose of clarifying those claims in light of the telephone interview that Applicant's undersigned representative had with the Examiner on June 12, 2012.

In the Office Action, claims 16-18 were objected to under 37 C.F.R. §1.75 as allegedly being substantial duplicates of claim 1. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-9, and 11 were objected to because of informalities and are amended herein to address these informalities. In addition, the Office Action set forth grounds of rejection as follows:

1. Claims 1-4 and 16-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter.
2. Claims 17 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement.
3. Claims 1, 2, 5-9, 12, 13 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
4. Claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Britton et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,925,457 B2; hereinafter "Britton").
5. Claims 17-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Britton.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the afore-mentioned telephone interview conducted with Applicant's undersigned representative on June 12, 2012. In the interview, the Examiner's and Applicant's representative discussed possible amendments to independent claim 1. Based on the interview, Applicant believes that the Examiner has agreed to withdraw the cited art rejections of the pending claims based on the foregoing amendments to the independent claims.

## **II. CLAIM OBJECTIONS**

The Examiner objected that independent claims 1 and 16 were duplicate claims. However, these claims, while having subject matter in common, also recite subject matter that makes the claims different from one another. For example, claim 16 includes the recitation, not found in claim 1, that “for each Semantic Web structured resource, there are a plurality of tagged statements, and for each tagged statement there are a plurality of component words.” Similarly, claim 1 includes the recitation, not found in claim 16, that “each of the predicates, instances, types of said instances, and literal values is found in at least one of the at least one Semantic Web Structured resources.” Applicants respectfully submit that, based on either of the foregoing recitations, claims 1 and 16 are patentably distinct from one another, and the Examiner’s objection to these claims as allegedly duplicates of one another should be withdrawn.

The Examiner further alleged that claim 1 included an informality. Applicant respectfully submits that the foregoing amendment to claim 1 addresses this objection.

## **II. SECTION 101 REJECTIONS**

Without conceding the merits of the rejections, the foregoing amendments to claims 1 and 16 are believed to address the Examiner’s Section 101 rejections.

## **III. SECTION 112 REJECTIONS**

### **A. Section 112, First Paragraph**

The Examiner stated that dependent claims 17 and 18 fail to meet the written description requirement because, allegedly, the specification does not reasonably convey possession of “non-web data” as recited in the claims. The Examiner’s attention is directed to paragraph 23 of Applicant’s Specification, the third sentence of which states that “[r]esources can include Web pages, part of a Web page, . . . a collection of pages, a Web site, or other RDF structured object.” (Emphasis added.) Applicant respectfully submits that at least this portion of the Specification, particularly when read in light of the Specification as a whole, would have reasonably conveyed to the skilled artisan that Applicant was in possession of a method in which “at least one of the Semantic Web structured resources has been converted from non-web data” (claim 17) and “the non-web data includes at least one of a database table and a database extract” (claim 18). Therefore the Section 112, first paragraph, rejections of claims 17 and 18 should be withdrawn.

**B. Section 112, Second Paragraph**

Without conceding the merits of the rejections, the foregoing amendments to claims 1, 2, 4-5, 7-9, 12-13, and 16 are believed to address the Examiner's Section 112, second paragraph, rejections.

**IV. SECTION 102 REJECTIONS**

As stated above, Applicant understands the Examiner to have agreed that the pending Section 102 rejections of the independent claims (and therefore all prior art rejections of the dependent claims) will be withdrawn in light of the foregoing amendments to the independent claims.

## V. CONCLUSION

In view of the remarks, all claims are in condition for allowance over the references of record. Therefore, all rejections have been addressed and this response is believed to be a complete response to the Office Action.<sup>1</sup> In view of the above, the presently pending claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

It is believed that any fees associated with the filing of this paper are identified in an accompanying transmittal. However, if any additional fees are required, they may be charged to Deposit Account 18-0013, under order number 65632-0218. To the extent necessary, a petition for extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a) is hereby made, the fee for which should be charged against the aforementioned account.

Dated: June 22, 2012

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Charles A. Bieneman/  
Charles A. Bieneman

Registration No.: 51,472  
Michael B. Stewart

Registration No.: 36,018  
RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC  
Correspondence Customer Number: 25537  
Attorney for Applicant

---

<sup>1</sup> As Applicant's remarks with respect to the Examiner's rejections are sufficient to overcome these rejections, Applicant's silence as to assertions by the Examiner in the Office Action or certain requirements that may be applicable to such rejections (e.g., whether a reference constitutes prior art, motivation to combine references, assertions as to dependent claims, etc.) is not a concession by Applicant that such assertions are accurate or such requirements have been met, and Applicant reserves the right to analyze and dispute such assertions/requirements in the future.